Treatise of State Suicide:

How a State Dissolves its Own Constitutional Order

By Nicholas J Hurley

14 June 2025

0th Edition

Future editions may revise, refine, and expand. This edition has been rushed to publication in its current form due to exigent and escalating circumstances. It is not final, polished, or exhaustive, but it is True.

This is a foundational draft. Due to rapidly deteriorating real-time events, it has been urgently expedited for release without the normal polish or exhaustive citations for a work or finding of this magnitude. It must be rushed into publication in order for it to be a document useful to those in our time, and not merely a post-mortem analysis.

It also creates a historical record of the Truth and when it was known:

The Federal Government of the United States of America has committed State Suicide by its own unilateral, willful, and unlawful actions, and no longer holds jurisdiction, legitimacy, or constitutional authority under its own Constitution or any existing legal framework.

I release this unfinished product now because time for peaceful recourse is short, and silence or inaction is complicity. The logic, reasoning, and evidence is overwhelming and its ultimate conclusion is, unfortunately, inescapable:

The State is dead. It committed Suicide.

The U.S. Republic under the Constitution of 1789 has ended.

CC0 / Released into the Public Domain

This entire work, including but not limited to its content, text, and ideas are published directly by its author to the Public Domain and Creative Commons Zero, as laws are applicable. If more than one applies in a jurisdiction, the greatest freedom of use is to be applied. No Rights are Reserved by the Author.

Any person or organization is free and encouraged to copy, modify, translate, distribute, perform, or otherwise use this work for any purpose, and permission is universally and irrevocably granted in perpetuity. Attribution is appreciated in the spirit of truth, but not required.

This Treatise is written to serve the People, the Constitution, and the historical record. When future generations look back on this era, they must know that the truth was recognized and named, and that there were those who tried to make it known by all in our time.

These works belong to the whole of Humanity and its posterity for all time.

God save the Republic.

Foundational Definitions:

These definitions are so central to this work, that they must be established at the outset of this document. The reader must understand and recognize their true and legal meanings to prevent either genuine misunderstanding or the deliberate distortion by bad-faith actors. Any attempt to refute or circumvent the conclusions of this Treatise by redefining these terms will be ignored out of hand; to do otherwise would demand the rejection of the idea that words have meaning. Such an action would remove all coherence and is contrary to the nature of discourse, rendering such discussion mute and impossible.

Many ideas have origins with Political Philosophers such as Rousseau and Lock, and some documents of American origin, such as the Federalist Papers and Declaration of Independence. While these are not held in the same esteem under law as the Constitution, they are foundational to the American Idea. They are to the U.S. Constitution as the concept of numbers is to Calculus. Calculus makes no sense without the concept of numbers, and could hardly be said to be possible to develop without them. Just as the ideas and phrases in the Constitution make no sense without Rousseau, Locke, Federalist Papers, and the Declaration of Independence. The Constitution could not have been made in any recognizable form without them. To argue the merit or usefulness in this is to argue against that of the Constitution itself.

Rights: A set of protections and liberties inherently held by individuals, organizations, or subordinate political entities which are guaranteed under a system of government. These are conditions which may not lawfully be violated by the State. They ensure the protection of life, liberty, and property and act as the foundation of lawful governance. Any violation of which by the State constitutes a breach of the Social Contract. Rights are recognized and protected by the State, but do not originate from the State. Rights exist without regard to the existence of a State. They are innate, inalienable, naturally occurring.

Social Contract: a document or Constitution which is the foundation for lawful governance over a People, under which terms they have collectively consented to be governed. It defines the legitimate authority of the State and establishes the mutual obligations owed between the People and the State.

Under the Social Contract, the State is bound to protect the Rights of the People, including their lives, liberties, and property. In exchange, the People owe obedience to the laws which are enacted with their collective consent, and pledge to defend one another and the State against external invasion.

The legitimacy of the State rests on its continuous adherence to the Social Contract. The People, having established the Social Contract amongst themselves to create the State, always retain their Sovereign Right to withdraw their consent and dissolve the State if the State violates its duties and obligations under this agreement. If the State breaches its terms under the Social Contract, especially in ways that cannot be lawfully remedied within its framework, the People have the Right and obligation to dissolve the Contract and reconstitute a new one which secures their Rights and restores lawful governance.

State vs. state: a State (capital "S") is a community or society politically organized under one independent government within a definite territory and subject to no outside control. A State has Universal Jurisdiction, Absolute Sovereignty, and a monopoly on the legitimate use of violence or force within its established territory.

A state (lower-case "s") is a political subdivision within the United States of America (ex. California, Texas, Virginia). These entities posses their own constitutions, governments, and legal systems with certain powers and Rights under the Constitution of the United States. A state in the United States is similar or equivalent to a province or region in other systems of government.

Jurisdiction: The authority under an established legal framework granted to a body of government to enforce laws, enact justice, and exercise power over individuals or other legal entities.

Universal Jurisdiction (domestic): Supreme and comprehensive jurisdiction a sovereign State possesses within its defined territory and all people within that territory. Unless lawfully limited by Treaty, Constitution, or mutual compact, the State has ultimate authority to legislate, adjudicate, and enforce laws on all persons and activities within its borders without permission by external powers. All States possess Universal Jurisdiction and Absolute Sovereignty as prerequisites to their lawful existence. Without Universal Jurisdiction within its territory, no State can be said to have sovereignty or legitimacy.

Sovereignty: The supreme authority to make binding decisions over all persons, actions, and legal entities within a defined territory. It grants the State the exclusive Right to legislate, enforce laws, administer justice, and define its own institutional structure. In a republican form of government, Sovereignty originates from the People and is conditionally

delegated to the State through the Social Contract. The legitimacy of this authority depends entirely on the State's adherence to the terms of that Contract.

Absolute Sovereignty: The indivisible power of a sovereign State over all persons and actions, and judicial matters within its territory. It encompasses all legislative, judicial, and executive powers, constrained only by the State's own Constitutional framework and Social Contract. Treaties, compacts or federalist delegation may also limit this power so far as they are consistent with the Constitution. Absolute Sovereignty, with Universal Jurisdiction, is a prerequisite to a State's lawful existence.

Republic: the name of any State that is governed by Laws rather than by the will of individuals (Rousseau). A law is only a law if it is legitimate. A law's legitimacy comes from its creation and public declaration from the Legislature in accordance with the procedures established in the State's Constitution and Social Contract, and equally applied to all.

The Legislature is composed of either the whole of the population, or those Representatives who are duly elected and consented to by the People of which they represent. The Legislative power belongs to the People, and can belong to it alone (Rousseau). Laws created by any other but the Legislature are no more than decrees or edicts by an individual, and are not legitimate, nor are they legitimately or lawfully enforceable.

General Will: The Will of the People collectively towards their shared interests and common good, with general application and consideration of the law to all, universally. Takes no consideration of private desires and governs all as equals under a just and legal order.

Specific Will: The Will of a specific individual or faction of individuals in pursuit of a private interest, contrary to or notwithstanding the General Will. It may coexist within a republic when constrained by law. When it dominates or takes the place of the General Will it necessarily becomes a source of injustice, corruption, and tyranny.

Legitimacy: The Right to govern and exercise power, as recognized and consented to by the People and in accordance with established legal frameworks of a Constitution, Social Contract, and laws. Distinguishes lawful governance from unlawful occupation by force. Not synonymous with power, force of arms, or mere ability to impose one's Will.

Consent of the Governed: The idea and Principle that all legitimate power comes from the voluntary and informed agreement of and by the People, which enables them to be governed under the specific terms of the Social Contract and Constitution. Consent is an ongoing event and may be withdrawn if the State violates its terms of the Social Contract.

Rule of Law: The idea that all People, organizations, and the State itself are subject to and accountable under the law. That laws are created generally and applied equally to all, including to the State and those acting on its behalf. Laws are and can only be created by the Legislature, validated by the Judiciary, and enforced by the Executive. No body or individual may create laws except for the Legislature.

Despot: One who sets themselves above the laws (Rousseau). Replaces rule by consent and legal authority with the rule of arbitrary and Specific Will.

Tyrant: One who aggregates to themselves the Sovereign authority without having a Right to it; A individual or group of individuals who govern violently without regard for justice or he law; acting in contradiction to the laws. Tyrant and Usurper are interchangeable terms, those who seize or exercise power without legitimacy (Rousseau).

State Suicide: A condition when breaches by the State of its own foundational legal framework are so severe, systemic, and unremedied that no lawful mechanisms remain to correct or constrain its actions. Technicalities are not remedies; if no lawful mechanisms remain in practice, then neither do they remain in fact. The State voids its own claim to legitimacy once it no longer binds itself to conditions by which their obedience was once owed. The People are thus no longer bound by duty or consent to the State. A State's self-termination of legitimacy and authority to rule over free People.

Zombie State: A political entity which continues to operate and exert force over a People once the State has irreparably severed its own legitimate and Constitutional foundations. It is no longer a lawful government but a decaying vestige of what once was a State; animated by bureaucratic inertia and force rather than lawfulness and consent of the People. It may retain outward appearances of legitimacy while functioning outside the bounds of the Social Contract and lawful Constitutional framework which once established and bound its original existence. It is the consequence of State Suicide.

Acts of State Suicide Performed by the Federal Government of the United States:

1) Failure of Executive and Legislature to Protect the Legislature; 06 January 2021

On January 6, 2021 the Capitol of the United States of America, with a full Joint Session of Congress and the Vice President in attendance, was violently attacked by thousands of armed and unarmed people. The purpose of these attackers was to prevent the lawful and Constitutionally-mandated tallying of electoral votes and certification of the electoral victory of then-candidate Joe Biden. This was not a spontaneous gathering of individuals, but a planned and organized rally of supporters from across by then-President Donald Trump, in opposition to his election loss. During the rally, then-President Trump stirred the fervor and anger of his supporters in the face of his election loss, and claiming he should be the true victor despite the reality of the outcome. He told his supporters they had to "fight" and directed them to action at the Capitol where Congress and the Vice President were meeting, for the purpose of preventing the fulfillment of their Constitutional duties.

To be plain: The President of the United States, in retaliation for his loss in a free and fair election, rallied his supporters and commenced a violent insurrection against the Legislative Branch of the Federal Government of the United States.

For the Chief Executive to commit such a willful and deliberate and premeditated action was an Act of War against the Legislature by the Executive Branch. The Legislature, being the voice of the People, and their General Will. The Legislature, having been most recently elected and entered into office at the Will of the People just days prior to this event, being the People's most current consented elected officials. The Legislature, who by Constitution, legal, and philosophical legitimacy are the Supreme Sovereign of the State, was violently attacked by the Executive Branch. This is therefore not merely an act of aggression by one branch of government against another, but an Act of War by the Executive against the People of the United States themselves.

Then-President Trump had loudly and often stated that he would only accept the results of an election if he felt it was "legitimate," and that it would only be "legitimate" if he won. That if he lost, it could only be due to maleficence or trickery or fraudulent activity. Upon losing, he repeated these claims publicly, while dramatically walking back his claims in courts, and over 60 independent courts ruling against his claims. Many of his lawyers having disciplinary action taken against them by the courts or their BAR associations for legal misconduct in these cases. The fact that, in full knowledge of the situation, several hours passed and numerous senior officials pleaded with President Trump to send the

Armed Forces to protect the Legislature and Vice President, to which he repeatedly refused. These facts have been widely reported and as they are in official court records and Congressional reports, publicly listed on the internet, and are easily accessible in full to all. These facts definitively establish the intent of the President to alter and overthrow the Legislative Branch for the purpose of extra-constitutionally retaining power as the Chief Executive.

For the Chief Executive to commit such a willful, deliberate, and premeditated action was an Act of War against the Legislature by the Executive Branch. The Legislature, being the voice of the People and their representation of their General Will. The Legislature, having been at the time the public officials most recently elected and entered into office just days prior to this event, therefore being the People's most current consented elected officials and representing the General Will of the People. The Legislature, who by Constitutional, legal, and philosophical Legitimacy are the Supreme Sovereign of the State, was violently attacked by the Executive Branch. This is therefore not merely an act of aggression by one branch of government against another, but an Act of War by the Executive against the People of the United States themselves.

When the Chief Executive, being responsible for the execution of the laws passed by the Legislature, who are the Representatives and consented to by the People, physically attacks the Legislature or prevents it from performing its duties as mandated by the Constitution, the Chief Executive places itself in a State of War with the Legislature and the entirety of the People of the nation. As the aggressor in this State of War against the Legislature and the People, the Chief Executive is in Rebellion against the State. The Chief Executive, then, has renounced their lawful and legitimate authority over any function or title or position of the State, and reverts to that of a private individual. A private individual in open Rebellion against the State for the purpose of overthrowing and invalidating its Constitution and the Social Contract between the State and its People. It is a betrayal of the Duty and Trust placed in them by the People in the most extreme sense.

It cannot be said by any rational mind that in a Republican system of government the Executive can retain its legitimacy and lawful status once it has engaged in open hostilities against the Legislature. How can an Executive exist without the Legislative Branch in a Republican system of government? Without the Legislature, from where do its laws originate? How are senior Executive officials, or judges, or military officers approved of their offices? Without the Legislature, there is no Supreme Sovereign or expression of the General Will of the people. Without this expression and representation of the People's General Will, the concept of a Republican system of government becomes nonsensical. It is self-contradictory on its face, standing in opposition to its very definition.

Unfortunately, the Executive was not alone in its breach of Duty and Trust: the Legislature itself failed in this as well. The Legislature, who's members and staff fled for their lives in the face of a violent insurrectionist mob, catastrophically failed in its duty to hold those responsible who attacked the Supreme Sovereign of the United States: the Legislators whom the People had consented to have create their laws to live under. If the Legislature is altered not by consent of the People, but by independent or coalition of individuals acting of their specific Wills and not that of the People's General Will, the Legislature cannot be said to be that same entity which the People consented to in its Social Contract with the State.

The Constitution is a Social Contract between the State and its People for how the country will be governed. It is a contract, just as any other, and is what gives Legitimacy to its enforcement and execution and legal framework. A contract being altered unilaterally, such that it no longer functions the same or is fundamentally altered without both parties' consent, it is no longer valid. It cannot be said that a party can preemptively consent to unlimited and yet-unknown future alterations of a contract. The Executive, by engaging in a State of War against the Legislature and prevented it from carrying out its duties as directed to and by the consent of the People, altered the Legislature and therefore fundamentally altered the Social Contract. The Legislature, is the representation of the People's General Will. The attack on the Legislature, therefore, was an attack on the People themselves.

How could it be claimed by any but either the servile or most extreme pacifists that the People would not act in self defense against an unprovoked attack which threatened their very lives and existence? To defend itself from this Act of War from the Executive, it was the Duty and Obligation of every member of the Legislature to Impeach and Convict the President for this alteration of the Legislature. Therefore, when the Legislature failed in its duty to defend itself, and by definition failing to defend the People, from violent and unprovoked aggression by Impeaching and Convicting the President, they failed in their most basic Duty and Trust given to them by the People. A paralyzing number of the Legislature allowed Factionalism to override their Trust to the People, and betrayed their Consent, and thus altering the Legislature itself. In addition to the Executive altering the Legislature through its unprovoked and violent attack to dissolve and alter the Legislature, the Legislature altered itself through the abdication of a paralyzing number of its members openly refuting their Duty and Trust and consent of the People. For how could People consent to having their Social Contract altered such that their Legislature would allow itself and the People to be violently and physically attacked by the Executive and its unlawful force? Even if one could submit themselves to such an unlimited and arbitrary Master, no one has the Right to offer any other person to such an outcome. This would create an open-ended contract without boundaries, with unlimited duties by the people; where everything

was owed, but nothing was protected or guaranteed. A contract which is null and void on its face.

This is State Suicide. The State has nullified its own Constitutional legitimacy and Social Contract with the People from whom it derives legitimacy and power.

2) SCOTUS Ruling Trump v United States; 01 July 2024

The United States of America is by its Constitution a republican system of government. The very nature of a republic form of government is that it exists to protect the Rights and liberties of the People who have established and live under it. A republic has a Supreme Sovereign, which is the Legislature. The Legislature derives this status and power directly from the People, since it is composed of the People's duly elected representatives as the voice and expression of their General Will. The Executive Branch exists to enact the laws passed by the Legislature. The Judiciary exists to interpret the laws and Constitution and ensure that the Executive and Legislature are abiding by the Constitution and by default, the Social Contract.

In a republican system of government, the laws must necessarily apply universally to every living person in its territory. To have anyone not bound by the laws, would by definition make them a Master over the other branches of government and the People, who would be the Servants or Slaves to the Master's arbitrary and Specific Will. The People are logically and legally incapable of consenting to the establishment of a Master over themselves in a republican form of government; since one does not have the power to establish themselves Master over another person, they themselves do not have the power to erect another as Master over any other person, either. The US Constitution recognizes this, and expressly states that it guarantees the People of every state a republican form of government (Article IV, Section 4), and that every Person is guaranteed Equal Protection under the law (Amendment 14). To have a Master, one who is not bound to the law, and therefore can violate it without repercussions, would then necessarily self-nullify the guarantees of republican forms of government and equal protection under the law. For how could it be republican government if someone is allowed to break the law with impunity? How can there be equal protection for all if some are allowed to violate the Rights of the People?

On July 1, 2024, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that the President of the United States of America is immune from criminal or civil prosecution for any "Official Acts" they perform while in office. The Supreme Court declined to define what is meant by "Official Acts," and has left it up to the Executive to define what counts as an "Official Act."

That is to say, the President of the United States is the one who now decides what acts they perform are “Official Acts.” The President decides for which acts the President is granted legal immunity. The President themselves decides if and when the laws of the United States apply to themselves. The then-former President’s own lawyers even persuasively argued to the Supreme Court that if the President of the United States were to order, as Commander in Chief, that the military execute their political rival, that would count as an “Official Act.” The Supreme Court of the United States has therefore concluded that the President gets to be the judge of their own trial; the Supreme Court has established on its own authority that the President of the United States is a Master to the People of the United States of America.

This is blatantly anti-republican and unconstitutional. However, it also has the full force of law, since how could one be prosecuted if the courts themselves don’t recognize the defendant as being capable of criminality? The President and Supreme Court have decided that the President has the power to arbitrarily execute citizens of the United States of America. At any time or place, without notice or warning or Due Process, any person in the United States is now subject to summary execution outside the bounds or protection of the law. This philosophically, logically, legally, and Constitutionally self-nullifies the Constitution and Social Contract. The People are incapable of consenting to being arbitrarily executed outside the rules of law, and are likewise incapable of consenting to a governing system which allows this to be a power of the State or a single individual and Master. Since they are unable to consent to such a system, and the power and legitimacy of the Constitution are derived from the consent of the People, the Constitution no longer has power or legitimacy. It has been self-terminated by the Supreme Court and Executive Branches of government. The Legislature has taken no action and is prevented by a paralyzing number of its members from taking any action to remedy this grave breach of the Constitution.

The State has placed a Master above itself, and relegated its People from where it derives its power and legitimacy as subservient and enslaved by the system in which they placed their Trust and Duty to protect the People. The State has placed the People for whom it was established to protect their liberties at the arbitrary and Specific Will of a single individual who may take their lives at any time with no possibility of legal or peaceful recourse, and deprived them of their Due Process Rights under the Constitution.

This is State Suicide. The State has unilaterally terminated its legitimacy under its own Constitutional framework.

3) Extraordinary Rendition, Denial of Habeas Corpus & Due Process; January 2025

The writ of Habeas Corpus roughly translates to "you shall have the body," and traces its lineage to 12th Century England. It is additionally found in Article I section 9 of the US Constitution, that "the privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it." Article I of the Constitution lists the powers, responsibilities, and duties of the Legislative Branch. Since it is not mentioned again in the Constitution, this can only mean it is a power reserved for the Legislature alone to suspend Habeas Corpus, and as specified, *only* in the case of Rebellion or Invasion. The reason it is important is this: Habeas Corpus is what guarantees individuals the Right to contest their detainment by the Executive. Otherwise, anyone could be detained indefinitely and would be unable to contest the legality or legitimacy of their detention.

Habeas Corpus must necessarily apply to every person in the jurisdiction of the United States. It cannot logically or legally be reserved only for select groups of people or citizens alone, because how would one prove they are entitle to this protection without being able to contest their detention and present the evidence in the first place? If it only applied to some, and excluded others, the State could simply claim you belonged to the excluded group and not allow you to contest your detention, even if you belonged to the group protected by Habeas Corpus. This has even been known to happen, where one is detained for "illegal immigration," and the arrested individual provides various forms of identification and birth records which prove they are US Citizens, only for the arresting officers to dismiss these documents as "fraudulent." Upon Habeas Corpus petition, the judge finds the documents are legitimate, and the individual is released with charges dismissed. If Habeas Corpus didn't apply to a group of individuals, and you were accused of being a member of that group, how else would you prove you weren't? It is logically and legally impossible to prove something if you don't have the Right or ability to be heard by a judge. To claim otherwise is to either be incapable of understanding or renounce all logic.

The same applies to Due Process Rights under the 5th Amendment of the US Constitution. If you are not allowed to plea your case or present evidence of your innocence of an alleged offense, how would you prove you did not commit any alleged crime? If certain groups of people are not guaranteed the Right to Due Process, how would any person prove they are a member of a group which *is* guaranteed this Right if never afforded this Right due to being accused of being a member of those of whom are not afforded this Right? Therefore, it necessarily follows that for *anyone* to be guaranteed the Right to Due Process or the Writ of Habeas Corpus, *all* persons, regardless of status or

group must be afforded these Rights. It is logically and legally incoherent for any alternative to be the case.

Since only the Legislature can legitimately suspend the Writ of Habeas Corpus, and only in times of actual Rebellion or Invasion, and that the Right of Due Process may never be suspended under the Constitution, if the Executive were to do so unilaterally in times of peace, this would be a gross violation of their legitimate authority under the Constitution and the Social Contract. The Executive branch has in fact been undertaking such actions since late January 2025. The Executive branch has unilaterally declared thru its actions that there are groups of people to whom Habeas Corpus and Due Process no longer apply. It has done so without legislation passed by the Legislature, and arbitrarily applied to the population of the United States. Certain individuals are declared "illegal immigrants", without warrants signed by a judge, exigent circumstances, or the burden of proof, and are detained indefinitely without the opportunity to challenge the legality and legitimacy of their detention or have their case heard in front of a judge and jury of their peers. These individuals are even moved around the country expeditiously by the State numerous times to ensure they cannot contact their lawyers, as is their Right under the 6th Amendment, and have their Writ of Habeas Corpus filed in the jurisdiction in which they are held. This is perfidy and obstruction of the Rights of the individual in explicit violation of the Constitution of the United States and the Social Contract.

What is worse, many of these individuals have been transported out of the territory of the United States to be held by foreign powers on behalf of the Federal Government of the United States of America. This is done for the explicit purpose of denying these individuals their Rights of Habeas Corpus and Due Process under the Constitution, and using funds which have not been appropriated by the Legislature for purposes which they are not allowed. The Executive has, at the very least, misappropriated funds, and at worst, has outright usurped the Appropriations powers of the Legislature in direct violation of the Constitution and Social Contract. Additionally, it has done so deliberately to deprive persons of their Rights under the Constitution, and knowingly to facilities where it is widely known to have Human Rights abuses take place as a feature of the facility. These El Salvadorian facilities are known for their gross overpopulation, torture, arbitrary killings, and forced labor for profit by the foreign State. Members of the El Salvadorian government, where these groups of individuals are sent by the United States Executive Branch without Habeas Corpus or Due Process, have described them as places where "the only way out of this prison is in a coffin." These are International Human Rights abuses, and for the United States Executive Branch to knowingly and deliberately send select groups of people to these facilities is, under Internationally recognized treaties, as Crimes Against Humanity.

These facilities are by appropriate definition: Concentration Camps. This term is used by the US Holocaust Museum as, “a site for the detention of civilians whom a regime perceives to be a security risk of some sort. What distinguishes it from a prison (in the modern sense) is that incarceration in a concentration camp is independent of any judicial sentence or even indictment, and is not subject to judicial review.” Individuals being detained without formal charges, moved to avoid Habeas Corpus, and sent to foreign prisons without trial for the purpose of avoiding trials and escaping US jurisdiction, is by definition, not subject to judicial review. These are by definition extra-judicial detentions where those detained have no ability to contest their detention or plead their innocence. They are not charged with any crime. They are detained indefinitely. They are in a facility where their own jailors tell them the only way out is death. They have been charged with no crime and given a death sentence. Arbitrarily.

If one person or group is denied the Writ of Habeas Corpus and Due Process, then by definition no one has these Rights. If the Constitution guarantees these Rights, and only the Legislature has the power to suspend the Writ of Habeas Corpus, but the Executive takes it upon itself to arbitrarily dissolve this Writ without any Legislative action or even legitimate or lawful authority, then it has usurped the power of the Legislature and altered the Legislative Branch. The Executive has become Despotic and Tyrannical, and has entered a State of War on the Legislative Branch. Dissolving the Social Contract and Constitution by nullifying its terms and conditions, and making the Constitution self-contradictory. For if the Constitution guarantees the Wirt of Habeas Corpus and Due Process to all, but the Executive decides unilaterally that it can arbitrarily decree that they do not apply to certain groups, then the universal Rights guaranteed to all are not universally guaranteed to all. The Constitution and Social Contract are incomprehensible and self-nullifying.

The State has committed Suicide and abandoned its own legitimacy by dissolving the Constitution and Social Contract. The Legislative powers and Supreme Sovereignty revert back to the People.

4) Legal Death of Known-Living Persons; April 2025

The U.S. Fraudulently Declared Thousands Dead. It Also Erased Its Jurisdiction Over Them

The Trump Administration has openly admitted to fraudulently declaring thousands of people legally "dead" to pressure them into voluntarily leaving the country. (See: AP, CNN, NYT, Newsweek below) Here's the problem: Aside from being wildly Unconstitutional, illegal under US Federal laws, international laws, and likely Crimes Against Humanity, it is existentially dangerous. Here's the crux of why: The Dead Cannot Violate The Law.

I'll say it again: *The dead are <u>legally incapable</u> of violating the law.*

Just the same as President John F Kennedy cannot be posthumously charged with stealing your car, a person who has been fraudulently declared "dead" by the State cannot, either. The dead have no rights, no protections – save for those laws which protect corpses and estates – can't work, or own a home, or own property, or sign documents, or get married or divorced. However they carry no obligations under the law. The dead cannot be charged with crimes. So, while they have no Rights or protections from arbitrary or indefinite detention, torture, or extra-judicial murder by the State, they also exist outside its jurisdiction by its own doing.

This is completely different than mistakenly being declared "dead" when still alive. Because there are remedies to correct it, and the State is willing and able to do so; and in fact does rectify mistakes like this when discovered expeditiously. If the State willfully and fraudulently declares a person "dead" for the purpose of stripping their rights and freedoms, as we have in the current situation, that person is no longer under its control or legal jurisdiction. The dead cannot have warrants issued for them. The dead can't be lawfully detained or arrested (only extra-judicially so). They can't be sued by any government entity or individual person. The dead can't be evicted or deported. The dead can't stand trial or be convicted of a crime. The fraudulently "dead" are not "alive" in the legal sense, and since only the *living* are legally "persons," they don't legally *exist at all*. For simplicity, I will describe these people who have been fraudulently declared "dead" by the State as "ghosts" or "legal ghosts."

This means that acts or conduct that would be crimes in normal circumstances are no longer illegal, because there is no offender. There is no one for the State to press charges against. There's a famous skit by Trevor Moore titled, "It's Illegal To Say," where he satirically mocks speech laws. These "ghosts" could say those same things without satire, completely seriously, publicly and specifically and actionably calling for it to be carried out. There would have been no crimes committed. Even carrying out the acts wouldn't be

crimes because they aren't "persons" accountable under the law. Again, they exist outside the US's jurisdiction by its own willful and Unconstitutional actions.

Set aside heinous crimes like murder, rape, and terrorism for a moment. Even theft, a universally understood and commonly punished crime becomes un-prosecutable – because there is no legal person to charge with a crime. They could seize your home by force and there's nothing you could do under the law. Call the police? Who would they arrest? The "ghost" doesn't legally exist. They also can't be evicted through legal proceedings because the dead can't be listed as defendants. The only remedies you have are extra-legal in nature. That is to say, outside the law.

This also holds national security implications: if this person has ever had or currently in possession of Classified information, if they distribute or sell it, they can't be held liable since only the living can be accountable under the law. If they steal the secrets or commit espionage, the same thing applies. If they damage or destroy nuclear power plants, steal the gold at Ft. Knox or rob a bank, or burn down their neighbor's house, they can't be prosecuted under the law. The State which unlawfully erased them as Persons also erased its own jurisdiction over them. If they steal property and the government later and "revives" them, they can't even be prosecuted for possession of the stolen property, because the act of acquisition is inseparable from the continued act of possession. The State would have no legal means of recovering or forcing the return of any property or information acquired by the "ghosts" while illegally declared "dead." The State would have to openly admit and *prove* that the State deliberately, arbitrarily, and unlawfully deprived them of their Rights and protections under the law in order to show why they weren't prosecuted right away, and under discovery the Defense would uncover these gross violations of the Defendant's Constitutional Rights. Therefore, all evidence becomes Fruit of the Poisonous Tree, and any evidence related to it is inadmissible in court. Since there is no admissible evidence against them, the "revived" "ghost" cannot be convicted of a crime. The entire case against them would likely be Dismissed with Prejudice.

The State has also unilaterally renounced its monopoly on the lawful use of force. By fraudulently declaring these people dead, it legally exiles them beyond its own jurisdiction – within its own borders. The "ghosts" could steal, assault, or kill and neither Citizens nor the State would have any legal recourse under the law. No Citizens could sue for damages. The State, having willfully and negligently creating these "legal ghosts" has abandoned its Duty of Care to protect its citizens and their property. Most importantly, the State has renounced its Legitimacy and Sovereignty. This is not only a grotesque violation of the Rights of over 6,000 people but a violation which tears apart the very nature of the rule of law itself. It endangers the Rights of every man, woman, and child in the United States.

By deliberately and fraudulently ejecting these individuals from the Jurisdiction of the United States – while inside the territory of the United States – the Federal Government has unilaterally renounced its own Universal Jurisdiction. There is no lawful entity in the world that currently has Jurisdiction over these 6,000 people while they are within the United States. The US Government does not merely *not know* these people exist, as is common in every nation around the world when processing Customs checks on newly arrived persons. In these cases, the State effectively says, "I didn't know of you before, but I see you are alive and here and recognize your existence in my territory and I therefore have Jurisdiction over you." No, in this instance, the US Federal Government is not merely saying "I don't know of you," it is *actively refuting their very existence.* It is saying "I reject the idea of you being alive. I don't believe you exist, and I actively and continually reject the very idea of your existence at all." How could a State claim Jurisdiction over something that doesn't exist? How could it claim jurisdiction over something *it actively refutes as existing*.

The whole premise of the State and its government is that it has universal jurisdiction over those living within its territory. Jurisdiction gives authority. Without it, authority doesn't exist. The US Constitution and legal framework of the United States is that it has jurisdiction over all living people within its territory. It presupposes that all living, breathing people are legally alive. It does not and legally cannot have jurisdiction over the dead. The dead are not legally alive, and therefore are not legally people. Even slaves were recognized as people – people without Rights and brutally oppressed – but people nonetheless. The State never claimed prior to Emancipation that slaves didn't even exist. It didn't legally refute that they existed. The US Federal Government has now actively denied that these 6,000 people exist, and actively denies to have any jurisdiction over them.

This is NOT the same as delegating jurisdiction the states or territories, or tribal areas, or to inferior, state, and tribal courts around the country, or by Treaty with foreign powers for Diplomats. By delegating the Federal Government still has ultimate jurisdiction, and by diplomatic treaty *someone* still has jurisdiction, and the individual can be deported or have their immunity waived by the treaty country. This is the State claiming it doesn't have any jurisdiction at all over these 6,000 people, and neither does any other legal body anywhere in the world. The State is actively asserting that it has the right to arbitrarily decide over whom it has jurisdiction and is actively exercising this by knowingly renouncing jurisdiction over 6,000 living, breathing people within the borders of the United States. Therefore, the United States no longer has Universal Jurisdiction within its territory. Here's an example of why that's so important:

Say I claim to be the King of France. I have jurisdiction and thereby authority over every living person in the territory of France. If I were to lose jurisdiction over part of it, I no longer have authority over that part; that area is no longer part of France. If I as the King claim that the living are legally dead, how do I have jurisdiction over them? The dead don't legally exist. You can't have jurisdiction over something that doesn't exist. I claim they don't exist, so I claim I don't have jurisdiction over them. If I don't have jurisdiction over the people of France, where do I get my authority? In what way am I the King of France if I have no subjects or jurisdiction? I'm just some guy in – presumably – a castle. I have no force of law. I have no legitimacy. No one is under my legal authority. I am a King without subjects. I am therefore not a King.

The 14th Amendment guarantees equal protection to "…any person within its jurisdiction…" The "dead" are not "alive." Only legally "alive" people who are legally persons who fall under the jurisdiction of the United States. The Constitution does not and cannot claim jurisdiction over those outside its territorial borders. By the State asserting that it can arbitrarily declare someone or any group to be outside its jurisdiction at will without due process, you have no equal protection under the Constitution. The 14th Amendment is internally self-nullified. By arbitrarily determining who is or isn't a legal person, the State determines at will and without due process who is and isn't under the jurisdiction of the Constitution, and therefore determines at will who is and isn't a "ghost."

Universal Jurisdiction is a Binary event: either a State does have Universal Jurisdiction, or it does not. The Whole without a Part cannot be the Whole. Without Universal Jurisdiction, the Constitution and the many laws that demand obedience and obligation, and bestow Rights and protections, only apply when and to whom the State decides convenient. This is no mere changing or violation of the law. To violate the law and Constitution would be criminal and awful enough. This tears a hole in the very fabric of reality of our legal framework. The reality that says there laws which exist at all. The reality that says we have a Constitution and legal basis for the existence of the State and of the existence of government. The reality which states that there even are laws to owe obedience to and have Rights bestowed from. Without it, there is only raw force, not law.

This is not merely authoritarian backsliding. Even authoritarian States claim Universal Jurisdiction over those living within their territory. This is the State actively asserting that it does not have universal jurisdiction in its territory. This is the State actively asserting that it only has jurisdiction sometimes over some people in its territory. This is the State saying that it only has legitimacy sometimes in some places when it's convenient for it. This is not losing jurisdiction due to external invader, or armed internal rebellion, or

through a coup in government. This is the State deciding unilaterally, unprovoked, and unsolicited to renounce its Universal Jurisdiction, authority, and legitimacy as an entity within the legal framework of the Constitution and within the law. This is the State committing Jurisdictional Suicide.

No, that's not accurate enough. The State doesn't even have Absolute Sovereignty anymore. Absolute Sovereignty would mean that the US has ultimate authority within its territorial borders; But the Trump Administration created 6,000 people who are outside its Jurisdiction arbitrarily and at will. These 6,000 people have their own Sovereignty – and they're not even US Citizens – but they have legal Sovereignty inside the borders of the United States. These individuals didn't *themselves* claim Sovereignty, they had it *thrust upon* them by the State denying its own Sovereignty over them. The State is saying not only does it not have Absolute Sovereignty, the State is actively asserting that it can decide *when* and *whether* it wants to have any Sovereignty at all. At will. Arbitrarily.

This is the State committing actual Suicide.

The State doesn't exist within the law or even above the law or outside of the law, it exists *without* any law at all. The State has established that it doesn't exist within any legal frameworks; *any* legal frameworks either domestically or legal frameworks recognized internationally. It has no legitimate authority to do *anything*. It exists *in spite of not being within any legal framework* merely due to bureaucratic inertia.

This is State Suicide.

5) Levying War Against Them; June 2025

The Constitution and Social Contract provide the People with Rights, Liberties, and protections by the State, and in return the People owe obedience to local, state, and Federal laws. To give obedience to the State, one must also give certain obedience to those officials acting under the lawful authority of the State as well, since the State itself is not an entity, but is made up of people. The State has an obligation in order to receive this obedience: it must be recognizable. That is to say, the People must be able to readily recognize that they are interacting with a lawful representative of the State acting in their lawful capacity, and not merely a random individual asserting unlawful and illegitimate demands or force. If one is stopped by an individual who is not readily recognizable as a representative of the State, how does the person know they owe a level of obedience to them? How could they possibly? This is compounded if the individual refuses to identify themselves as a representative of the State, and even more so if they deliberately misidentify themselves or disguise themselves as someone who is not a representative of the State.

This is occurring presently across the United States by officers of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. Personnel from the Executive Branch are deliberately and systematically concealing their identities and State affiliations during their law enforcement activities. Additionally, these activities are being conducted systematically without warrants signed by a judge to for search, seizure, or arrest, as required by the 4th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Entering homes and businesses without a warrant or exigent circumstances in order to conduct a search or arrest is a gross violation of the Rights of the People. When done with perfidy and obfuscation of identity, it is not possible to differentiate these acts from those of armed individuals or organized crime who have no legitimate or legal Right to these acts, or People's obligation of obedience to obey. When this is done in neighborhoods, it is reasonable, expected, and a civic duty for the People of that community to investigate and determine the nature of this armed intrusion of their homes and communities and detention of their fellow Citizens. If the State officials commit perfidy and conceal their identities, how does the community know these are State officials, as opposed to organized crime pretending to be State officials? This is not a theoretical exercise, but an active and repeated actuality, where criminals and organized crime wear the same civilian clothes and ad hoc masks to impersonate State officials to rob, kidnap, rape, and murder residents.

The State officials have even refused to identify themselves, and committed perfidy by identifying themselves as utility workers to gain access to people's homes, bypassing their duty and legal obligation to possess a warrant signed by a judge. The State, while

concealing their own identities, refusing to identify themselves as agents of the State, and misrepresenting themselves as private commercial entities, also demand absolute protection under the law. They claim Qualified Immunity from any and all actions they take against the People while having no obligation to be recognizable or identifiable to those same People they are exercising law enforcement authority over. If the People resist what any reasonable person would perceive as an armed assault or invasion of their homes and businesses by illegitimate and criminal forces, they will be charged with assaulting a law enforcement officer. This requires the People to be omniscient, knowing the unknowable, while the State retains absolute immunity from any actions they take. The People cannot consent to what they are unaware of. This is illogical, unlawful, and unconstitutional on its face.

The State, by concealing its identity, refusing to identify, and making it impossible for a reasonable person to know they are interacting with an agent of the State, absolves itself of its monopoly on lawful force. It necessarily and unquestionably introduces Reasonable Doubt to any person to respond with the same lawful force they would against any private individual attacking them. How could the State claim a monopoly on lawful force if it disguises itself from the very People it claims this monopoly over? If an individual were to violently protect themselves from a person or group of people who disguise themselves and refuse to identify or provide proof of status of agent of the State, how could a jury of their peers possibly reach a verdict – beyond a reasonable doubt – that they assaulted law enforcement? The State itself introduced this reasonable doubt, with the explicit purpose of being unidentifiable.

The State also explicitly seeks to be anonymous in its enforcement of the law. It has become well known and explicitly admitted by the State that it commits perfidy and obfuscates identification as agents of the State to prevent this identification. This, coupled with their claim to Qualified Immunity, necessarily creates an environment where the State can commit any act with impunity and any peaceful redress of grievance to the State is impossible, because the People don't know who committed the violation of their Rights. This means the State is not only violating the People's 4th, 5th, 6th, and 14th Amendment Rights, but also their 1st Amendment Right to petition the government for redress of grievances. This is the core tenant of the Constitution and the Social Contract, because if the People are prevented from petitioning their government for redress of grievances or holding those who violate their Rights accountable under the law, what other peaceful options remain to them when their Rights and Liberties are violated? The State exists for the purpose of providing the People with peaceful means of protecting their lives, property, and liberties. If the State itself through its own deliberate obfuscation and perfidy prevents the People from achieving this, for what reason does the State exist at all? It is outrageous

in the extreme to assert the People can consent to such a state of being; that they give up all their protections under the law and owe all duties and obligations to those whom they cannot identify.

By obliterating the conditions under which lawful obedience, peaceful redress, and individual recognition of State authority are possible, the Executive Branch has effectively forfeited its claim to lawful governance.

These acts of warrantless entry, warrantless arrest, marching in force through neighborhoods to detain its residents, while concealing their identities and committing perfidy, are indistinguishable in the practical and legal sense from an occupying foreign armed force. The People, even in a society which they have consented to, always retain the Right to self defense against unlawful force. This must be the case, otherwise they subject themselves to abject servility to tyrannical and illegitimate force. When the State systematically and deliberately sends forth its agents to act on its behalf in contradiction to the Constitution and laws of the land, such as warrantless entry or arrest or unlawful force or obfuscation of identification or *systematically violating the Right of Due Process, Cruel and Unusual Punishment, and Writ of Habeas Corpus*, it unilaterally puts itself in opposition to them. It creates actions which are in practice, Constitutionally, and philosophically *foreign* to the Constitution and Social Contract under which the People of a State exist and consent to. They are then, in practice and Constitutional reality, Occupation Forces obedient to a force which is Foreign to the Constitution of the United States, the many states of the Union, and the People thereof. The State and its obeying actors are in every real, practical, and Constitutional sense, in a State of War against the People and states in which they are performing these acts.

The Executive Branch of the Federal Government of the United States has activated the California state National Guard to Federal Status, and has deployed thousands of these Soldiers to the city of Los Angeles, California. This is explicitly against the will of the Governor of California, who's state and local law enforcement leaders state there is no need for the deployment of the National Guard. Additionally, hundreds of Active Duty Marines have been sent to Los Angeles to assist the Federalized National Guard Soldiers and I.C.E. agents. It has been reported that Federalized or Federal Armed Forces of the United States of America have been performing direct law enforcement actions, including detention of individuals in a law enforcement capacity. This is confirmed by the Department of Defense.

This is being done explicitly to quell the protests by the People of that city in response to the agents of the Federal Government, Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, committing widespread and unlawful violence against its people through perfidy,

warrantless search and seizure, warrantless arrests, indiscriminate arrests on persons over whom they have no jurisdiction, namely arresting US Citizens for "unlawful entry into the United States" – an act US Citizens are legally and logically incapable of committing, and otherwise acting completely indifferent from a Foreign occupying force. Acting thus in accordance with a force which is Foreign to the Constitution of the United States.

Congress has passed no law authorizing the use of Federal Armed Forces in response to any insurrection, rebellion, or foreign invasion, as outlined in the Constitution. The President has not declared an insurrection in the city of Los Angeles in accordance with the Insurrection Act. The President has declared those protesting – a Constitutionally protected act – are in Rebellion against the Federal Government. The Courts have ruled that the President Federalizing the state National Guard for this purpose is unlawful. Since these orders originate explicitly from and with continued public support from the Executive Branch of the Federal Government and its Senior Officials including the Chief Executive, the Federal Government itself is acting as a force Foreign to the Constitution of the United States. The philosophical, legal, and Constitutional conclusion is apparent and unavoidable:

A State of War *has existed* between the Executive Branch of the Federal Government of the United States, and the state and People of California.

This is not a declaration of war or call for armed action, but a statement of fact of the reality of these circumstances. The Executive Branch is levying war and occupation with forces operating under authorities unlawful and foreign to the Constitution of the United States.

The Constitution of the United States of America specifically defines what constitutes "Treason" against the United States. Article III, Section 3 states, "Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or, in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort." The "*them*" in this instance, refers to the states themselves, not the Federal Government. This exists to ensure the states their rights under the Federalist nature of the Constitution. The states themselves compose the Sovereign, and are the ones to be protected, including from a tyrannical Federal Government. The Congress has the powers under the constitution to call up the militia and to deploy the military to states to suppress insurrection or rebellion. The Posse Comitatus Act prohibits the Federal Government from deploying Federalized armed forces to states for law enforcement. There are some exceptions to this, such as during an insurrection or authorized by Congress. For one to order the deployment of Federalized US Armed Forces to states for the purpose of law enforcement is legally, Constitutionally, and philosophically indifferent from armed occupation of the affected states.

“We will liberate LA” – President Trump in front of the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, NC; 10 June 2025

“We are not going away. We are staying here to liberate the city (of Los Angeles, CA) from the socialists and the burdensome leadership that this governor and that this mayor placed on this country and tried to insert into the city.” – Kristi Noem, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security; 13 June 2025

This section requires intent. These statements, that the Federal government intends to “liberate” a city and territory within the United States from its lawfully elected mayor and state Governor, during a time of peace, without any Congressional or state authorization, without any foreign invasion or internal rebellion, can only be seen as a real attempt by the Executive in the armed overthrow of a state’s duly elected governments. This is by definition the levying of war against the state of California.

The Executive Branch officials engaged in the planning, execution, and continuation of this State of War against the state of California and its People certainly meet this requirement. It is less certain, however, if the Armed Forces of the United States which have been thrust into this act of aggression against their own countrymen are aware of this fact. They must be given the benefit of the doubt and made aware of the significance and reality of their participation in levying war against a state of the United States. By waging armed occupation with forces operating under loyalty to an authority foreign to the Constitution of the United States against one state, California, the Executive Branch is necessarily levying war against the whole of the United States of America. This is not a metaphorical or linguistic tool; this is the factual philosophical, legal, and Constitutional reality: The Executive Branch and many of its Senior Officers of the United States is levying war against its many states, and is thus violating their Oaths to the Constitution and are committing Treason as defined by Article III, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States. In its literal, textual definition. The Executive Branch is again in a State of War against the United States of America and her People. The Executive Branch is operating as an illegitimate force foreign to the Constitution. It has dissolved its own authority to act and operate under the framework of the Constitution and without the Consent of its People, for the People cannot consent to have those they give power to attempt to end their lives and occupy themselves as a foreign and tyrannical force.

The United States of America is under armed invasion by a power foreign to its Constitution organized by its own Federal Executive Branch.

The State has committed Suicide.

Self-Nullifying Contradictions:

Each of these above acts independently constitute a terminal, existential breach of the Constitution and Social Contract. Each one standing alone is the Suicide of the State.

Marbury v Madison (SCOTUS, 1803) established that "any law repugnant to the Constitution is void." Therefore, since each of these situations mentioned are repugnant to the Constitution, they are also void and the Constitution is saved, correct? Well, no, not in our current situation. Marbury pre-assumed that the Judiciary would strike down such a law or act. That the Legislature would revise, repeal, or pass new legislation which would negate the repugnant act or law. That the Executive would refuse to enforce such a law. Each of those three mechanisms have been broken in our current state. These repugnant acts and laws are being carried out and either backed up or allowed with cold apathy or paralysis from the other branches of government. They therefore are carried out with the full force of the State apparatus and are in effect. If one branch violates the Constitution, it is a breach of the law and the other two branches reign it in. If one branch violates the Constitution, and the other branches endorse it or allow it to remain, that is a breach of the Constitution itself and the Social Contract. If one party to a contract can openly violate the terms of the agreement with impunity and there is no legal mechanism for the offended party to remedy the breach, the contract is nullified. Voided. Terminated. This is our current situation.

There are no alternative conclusions which are coherent, do not self-contradict, or rely on rejecting the premise of words having set meanings or create nonsensical alternative definitions for core concepts, such as "a republican government can include those which the executive has supreme and unchecked power." This would be describing a different form of government. Or that:

- The Rights of individuals can be both universal and arbitrarily applied

- The People are both guaranteed a republican form of government where they have Due Process Rights and Equal Protection under the law, but also may be arbitrarily and summarily executed by the State at any time with no recourse or protections

- The Executive can usurp powers reserved for the Legislature without judicial review and still be a republican form of government

- The State can both have Universal Jurisdiction and Absolute Sovereignty over all those living in its territory, and also unilaterally and arbitrarily decide over whom and when it is convenient for the State to have Jurisdiction over living persons within its territory

- The individuals' Rights to Due Process and Habeas Corpus can both be universal and also only apply to those whom and in what situations the State wants them to

- The Legislature can allow other branches of government to use those powers reserved solely for the Legislature, so long as enough members of the Legislature refuse to block the usurpation of its powers

- The Judiciary has the power to review the legality and Constitutionality of Executive actions or Legislation, but cannot use any funds to do so and cannot enforce its decisions with Contempt rulings if violated

- The Legislature has the Right to Oversight of the Executive's facilities and actions, but can be imprisoned or blocked from exercising this Oversight function

- The Constitution is still in force, even if the State renounces the terms and framework of that document, and is either unwilling or unable to remedy the breach of Social Contract

- The People can be functionally or explicitly prevented from voicing opposition to the State or seek and enact peaceful redress of grievances, and are still able to "consent" to the Social Contract

The Zombie State. What To Expect:

The Federal Government of the United States of America, through the unilateral, unsolicited, and unconstitutional acts of the Executive Branch, joined together with paralyzing apathy, factionalism, and complicity of the Legislative and Judicial Branches, has severed its own legitimacy, sovereignty, and authority under its Constitution and any recognized legitimate legal framework. The State committed Suicide.

What remains is a *Zombie State*: a political apparatus that continues to function externally while having internally terminated the legal foundations which once justified its existence. It no longer operates under lawful governance, but persists through bureaucratic inertia and raw force, poorly imitating consent of the People. The Zombie State does not exist within any legal frameworks, and as such is a danger to itself, its People, the international community. It may irrationally lash out at its own People or other States in the international community. Its lack of coherent internal structure will decay over time and become more obvious to even the uninformed and distant observer. This decay may unfold gradually over time, or violently and abruptly accelerate. It may be all at once or on spurts of degradation. Its very nature exceptionally unpredictable and unstable.

The Executive Branch can be expected to continue acting irrationally and incoherently, since there are no longer practical limits for its authority but what itself determines they are. Its actions are not taken in accordance with universally applicable laws or the General Will, but instead at the whim of arbitrary and singular Will. These arbitrary individual Wills may change as frequently as the tides or from any perceived personal slight to the Usurper. The Executive now governs by decree or Royal Edict. The Chief Executive has repeatedly demonstrated on numerous occasions by proclamation that the law is no longer determined by legitimacy from the Legislative Branch, but the Executive's own personal authority. That the Executive has seized for itself the Legislative powers which rightly belong solely to the People and their elected Representatives. This is now precedent in the United States, that the Executive Branch can, at will, usurp the Legislative powers and retain power as a tyranny.

The Judiciary is for all practical purposes, and in all matters which are of importance to the People and continuance of the republic, incapacitated. Factionalism and coercion prevents its lawful opposition to the Executive, and instead either reinforces or is incapable from preventing usurpation of its powers by the Executive. It is no longer willing or able to safeguard its powers or defend its Constitutional responsibilities. The Legislative Branch has shown this paralysis or complicity prevents it from safeguarding the powers delegated from the People to it alone, such as passing laws, raising taxes, imposing duties or tariffs, or appropriating funds from the Treasury to be spent for the common good. They are

incapable to defend themselves when obstructed by the Executive from exercising their lawful oversight authority. When obstructed, Legislative factionalism will reinforce the Executive. The Executive is, in reality, incapable of committing any act, crime, or violation of the People's or states' Rights that would lead to his Impeachment and Conviction.

The Legislature's 119th Congress of the House of Representatives has passed legislation in H.R.1 which incorporates Constitutionally prohibited acts such as Bill of Attainder, stating ahead of time that one party is guilty or punished before trial, and Ex Post Facto law, which retroactively alters the law. This makes an act which was legal in the past now illegal in the past. These are explicitly prohibited in the Constitution, but which factions of the Legislature seek to put into law for their personal and specific Will at the expense of the People. This one paragraph, obscured with over 1,000 pages of budget appropriations, retroactively alters judicial rulings, declares targeted parties guilty without trial, and strips the Judicial Branch of its Constitutional Authority:

"SEC. 70302. RESTRICTION ON ENFORCEMENT. No court of the United States may enforce a contempt citation for failure to comply with an injunction or temporary restraining order if no security was given when the injunction or order was issued pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c), whether issued prior to, on, or subsequent to the date of enactment of this section."

This one paragraph functions as Ex Post Facto law and Bill of Attainder, retroactively invalidating lawful court orders and shielding specific parties from accountability. It eliminates enforcement based not on legal merit but technical bond requirements, thereby selectively denying access to due process. This is a direct assault on Judicial Independence and the Rule of Law. This will make the Judicial Branch retroactively incapable of holding people in the Federal Government in Contempt of Court for willfully violating its rulings, and prohibits the Judiciary Branch retroactively from enacting Temporary Restraining Orders meant to prevent immediate and irreparable violations of Rights unless the plaintiff has sufficient funds to provide to the Federal Government for its own unlawful conduct. Past injunctions are nullified due to the nature of the Bill being retroactive. Future injunctions are legally and financially unattainable to any but the most wealthy. This proves the paralyzing number of the Legislature's own complicity or apathetic abandonment of its Duty under the Constitution and Social Contract.

This is not an isolated incident, but a symptom of the Zombie State. Future Bills of this nature are expected to arise, where specific individuals or groups are targeted for

specific benefit or punishment at the expense of the People. Where the People can no longer take comfort in acting one way today, because it may be retroactively illegal tomorrow to have done that act in the past. That Legislators fulfilling their legitimate Legislative duties or exercising their legitimate powers are punished or criminalized for doing so. Where the Legislature is bypassed and allows itself to be bypassed for the creation of new Laws.

The Judicial Branch now lacks a coherent and consistent framework with which to make rulings. The courts rely on the Constitution, laws, and established precedent to make rulings. Since there have been terminal events which have calcified into law and judicial precedent, future rulings will become increasingly incoherent, self-contradictory, and unreliable. An explicit example of this judicial incoherence has already occurred in Trump v. Wilcox, where the Supreme Court granted an emergency stay that effectively overruled longstanding precedent without full briefing, oral argument, or a clear rationale grounded in established law. As Justice Kagan warned in her dissenting opinion:

"...Because one way of making new law on the emergency docket... turns out to require yet another (the creation of a bespoke Federal Reserve exception). If the idea is to reassure the markets, a simpler—and more judicial—approach would have been to deny the President's application for a stay on the continued authority of Humphrey's. "To avoid an arbitrary discretion in the courts," Hamilton wrote, "it is indispensable that they should be bound down by strict rules and precedents." Federalist No. 78, p. 529 (J. Cooke ed. 1961). Today's order, however, favors the President over our precedent; and it does so unrestrained by the rules of briefing and argument—and the passage of time— needed to discipline our decision-making."

As contradictory and internally incoherent rulings accumulate, the People will have decreasing certainty and predictability as to what the law actually *is*, and how one in good faith can know they are following the law. This is explicitly incompatible with the very nature of the Rule of Law.

Zombie State Evolution:

As the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Branches' outward coherence and predictability dissolves, the Executive will step in with increasingly tyrannical force against the People in order to control social unrest which will inevitably result from the State's systemic, and presently inevitable, breakdown. By the time it is plainly obvious to all that the legitimacy of the State has been extinguished, and only an unrestrained and arbitrary Tyranny has taken hold, the avenues for peaceful recourse through the structural mechanisms which enable its collapse will have long passed. The Executive will openly and explicitly wield unchecked, unlimited, and arbitrary powers. The Judiciary and Legislature will be fully paralyzed or complicit.

At our current stage, that of the Zombie State, there are only four courses of events at our current juncture: Tyrannical Subjugation, Fragmentation, Revolution, and Reconstitution.

Tyrannical Subjugation:

This must be said to be the worst possible of all options. It leaves the People in a state of abject slavery; completely beholden and at the mercy of arbitrary brute force, with no laws or protections. Your life, property, and liberties can be forfeit at any time for any or no reason. The State owes you no obligation to let you know what the laws are, who the State's representatives are, or how you can act to remain safe. You must both obey in advance and change your own views whenever the State decides a new direction. If your views are known to be contrary to that of the State's, you can expect a visit from the State's enforcers, who may or may not be recognizable, and this may be the last time anyone hears from you and potentially your family. Collective punishment is not protected against in this scenario. You have no Rights. You have unlimited obligations.

This is inherently unstable, as there is no Rule of Law, no predictability for judicial proceedings, unknowable laws to guide your actions, no predictability for the economy to operate under, just pure unadulterated force. Force without law demands no obligation from its People, and as soon as a stronger force emerges, that will be the one which must be obeyed. Eventually, this stronger force will be either Fragmentation of the State or Revolution. The timeline for these events is not certain, and highly dependent on a huge number of factors which are unique and unpredictable to every case. However, history shows us these paths are inevitable once the State has abandoned its Social Contract.

Fragmentation:

As the Tyrannical State becomes increasingly unstable, which is an inevitable outcome as history has shown us, the State often fractures. This sometimes results in the original State surviving, with smaller territory and population, and sometimes a complete dissolution into entirely unrelated succeeding States. These fragmented States will become Revolutionary and, independently of one another, form new States consented to by the People, or new Tyrannical States which will repeat the cycle in one of the potential outcomes of Fragmentation, Revolution, or Reconstitution.

If the Tyrannical State initially survives in its reduced form, it will become exponentially unstable from its loss of territory and population and either fragment again or result in Revolution.

Revolution:

The Revolution occurs when the State has committed Suicide and the people, using their natural Rights of Sovereignty and Self-Defense, violently rise up against the Zombie State for the overthrow of its arbitrary, unlawful, and illegitimate power. This is, again, inherently unstable, as who is able to predict what faction will win and what kind of State will emerge from something as chaotic as a Revolution? The people will only return to a state of long-term peace and stability in the event a faction with the desire and ability to establish a republic with the consent of the People wins out over all others. This clearly is no guarantee, and many Revolutions result in new Tyrannical States, whether under new management or the original.

Reconstitution:

This is by far the most stable, peaceful, and *preferrable* outcome. The People living in a Zombie State, realizing their lot under arbitrary and unlawful rule can hardly be said to be better than a State of Nature, where no one is protected under a common set of laws but also has no obligations or duties to anyone but themselves, reject the current system entirely and form a new Social Contract from whole cloth. This can be accomplished by the People either explicitly withdrawing their consent from the current State, or simply ignoring the current State's existence, and establishing amongst themselves a new Constitution and Social contract for all to consent to and live under. Establishing a new State as the immediate and legitimate successor to the former. One with a State and government constrained by a new Constitution and set of laws, and protects the lives, liberties, and

property of the People who live within its territory. Where the People once again, in exchange for this protection and knowable laws which they consent to, owe obedience and a duty to protect it from forces hostile to the State and its People. It is the peaceful transition of power from the Zombie State to the legitimate, Reconstituted State. This is also the most difficult course, since it requires the knowledge and understanding that the State is dead, and by enough of the population, to carry out successfully.

<u>The Way Forward:</u>

The ideal path from a Zombie State is Reconstitution. It is recommended in the strongest and most urgent terms to pursue this course of action in the United States of America. It is vital for the widest possible population of the People to know, understand, and internalize that the Federal Government of the United States of America has committed State Suicide.

The State is dead, it killed itself. We must Reconstitute the legitimate government of the People, by the People, and for the People. We must accomplish this before the Tyrannical Subjugation can entrench itself into the apparatus of which the Armed Forces and law enforcement, designed for the protection of the People and their Rights, is turned into raw violence and force of arms against those same People by the entity of Tyranny. After that point, peaceful recovery of the People's Rights, Liberties, and protections under law and under a legitimate State becomes untenable, and its outcomes unstable and unpredictable. The only peaceful path forward is Reconstitution. The time for seizing this opportunity is rapidly closing.

***This is not secession, or rebellion*.**

This is the same path taken by the Founders of the United States when they met for a Constitutional Convention to replace the Articles of Confederation with the Constitution of 1789, which existed for over 200 years. The People always have the Right to reconstitute a new Constitution which has their consent and protects them, *before* the existing State fails completely. As Locke said in the Second Treatise of Government:

"But the state of Mankind is not so miserable that they are not capable of using this Remedy, till it be too late to look for any. To tell People they may provide for themselves, by erecting a new Legislative, when by Oppression, Artifice, or being delivered over to a Foreign Power, their old one is gone, is only to tell them they may expect Relief, when it is too late, and the evil is past Cure. This is in effect no more than to bid them first be Slaves, and then to take care of their Liberty; and when their Chains are on, tell them, they may act like Freemen. This, if barely so, is rather Mockery than Relief"

<u>The Difficult and Necessary Next Steps:</u>

- The People, through their local and state legislatures, or by general proclamation or referendum, state their grievances with the Federal Government. Stating how it is terminally breached its commitments and obligations under the Constitution and the Social Contract. That through a sustained pattern of irreparable breaches and continued systematic actions to these same grave and irreparable violations, the Federal Government has lost its Legitimacy to rule.
- That the People thereby withdraw their Consent to be governed by the Federal Government. As Consent of the People is the sole basis for that same government's authority, and as Consent has been rescinded, the Federal Government is rendered unlawful. Thereby, the Federal government has no lawful basis to take any actions, and any orders from it are thereby unlawful and void, and constitute unlawful force against the states and People.
- That the People of the states call for a Constitutional Convention to be expeditiously convened by representatives of the several states of the United States. That its purpose shall be to draft a new Constitution, which shall restore the Rule of Law and secure the Rights and Liberties of the People and states of the United States.
- During this interim period, to stave off foreign or unlawful domestic invasion, the state legislatures and governors, using their powers under the Constitution, call forth their state militias and raise such additional forces as may be required to:
    - Protect their citizens from unlawful aggression by any occupying or usurping force.
    - Defend the Rights and Liberties of the People during the dissolution of illegitimate power.
    - To defend the Representatives of the several states convening the Constitutional Convention, ensuring the lawful and peaceful transition to a reconstituted government under the protection of legitimate state authority.
    - These forces shall be sworn to Protect, support, and defend the Constitution of the United States, not in its corrupted and betrayed form, but in the original spirit of which it was ratified: grounded in the Consent of the People, governed by Reason, and bound by Law.

The window for peaceful remedy is rapidly closing. This is not a threat or call to arms, but a statement of historical and contemporary fact. The People and states must withdraw their Consent of the Federal Government and call a Constitutional Convention to reconstitute a legitimate, lawful government consented to by the People.

Declaration of Withdraw of Consent from the Federal Government of the United States of America:

We, The House of Representatives/ the People of [City/County/State], in solemn assembly, do hereby declare:

That the Federal Government of the United States, through its sustained and willful acts, including but not limited to violations of due process, usurpation of Constitutional authority, unilateral nullification of judicial power, and the abandonment of the rule of law, has terminally violated the Constitution and Social Contract and thereby forfeited all Legitimacy.

That it has forsaken its obligations to protect the life, liberty, and property of the People, dissolved the separation of powers, nullified the Rule of Law, and removed all lawful avenues of redress.

That we, the People, having entered into no irrevocable compact with a government which now exists in existential breach of its foundational contract, do hereby withdraw our Consent to be governed by the Federal Government of the United States.

That we affirm our allegiance to the Constitution of the United States as ratified in 1789, and reject the authority of any person or office acting outside its bounds.

Let it be known that our Consent is not granted to be ruled by arbitrary force, but by lawful governance alone. And where law is abandoned, so too is our obligation to obedience.

We no longer recognize its authority as lawful, nor its commands as binding.

We do not acknowledge its claim to Jurisdiction, Sovereignty, or Representation.

We declare its laws, decrees, and enforcements void where they conflict with our Rights and the original Constitution.

That we hereby call for a Constitutional Convention, composed of representatives from the several states and their People, to restore lawful governance, reconstitute Federal authority on a legitimate legal and Constitutional framework, and ensure the permanent protection of the Rights of the People.

Citations:

Foundational Texts:

Articles of Confederation of the United States of America
Constitution of the United States of America
Declaration of Independence (United States of America)
The Federalist Papers; Hamilton, Jay, Madison
The Second Treatise of Government; John Locke
The Social Contract; Jean-Jacques Rousseau

Legally Dead Known-Living Persons:

- https://apnews.com/article/living-immigrants-dead-social-security-numbers-trump-c10737cbe36e3108fb244a555777d880
- https://www.cnn.com/2025/04/11/politics/trump-administration-social-security-dead-dhs/index.html
- https://www.nytimes.com/2025/04/10/us/politics/migrants-deport-social-security-doge.html
- https://www.newsweek.com/social-security-numbers-cancelled-thousands-migrants-marked-dead-stop-benefits-claims-what-know-2058386

US Holocaust Memorial Museum
https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/the-nazi-camp-system-terminology

Supreme Court of the United States:

- Trump v. United States (01JULY2024)
- Trump v Wilcox (22MAY2025)

H.R.1, 119th Congress (2025-2026), Section 70302; (22MAY2025)